

WHOLE NO. 480.

send up a delegation that can carry any question they please; so it might readily happen that decisions might be made which would involve us in the west in responsibilities, repugnant to our own judgment. This risk would be obviated by the proposed change; while the real union between us and our eastern brethren, and all its advantages, would still

The editor of the Pennsylvania Freeman, we are

May it not become proper for the Executive committee at New York to bring the question before abolitionists generally?

From the Barnstable Patriot.

MR. EDITOR:—We have had the Rev. H. Cummings lecturing in this place, for the purpose of

creating a division in our anti-slavery ranks; the main points at issue may be seen by referring to the letter of E. Wright, Jr., (previously published in the Patriot), who is editor of the Massachusetts Abolitionist, and the editor of the late Boston Herald.

tionist, and to the doings of the late county meeting at Orleans. He remarked in his lecture, and on inquiry, told us that he could prove that the words 'all persons' were not originally in the Constitution of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society: that he

would also prove to our satisfaction, that the Massachusetts Anti Slavery Society had adopted the Non-Human-Government Principles. In the next lecture, he went on to tell us what took place at a

meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in Boston, the Hon. Seth Sprague presiding, (leaving us to understand that he was present at said meeting;) he then told us a story that he had from Mr. Phelps, which was as follows:

Mr. Phelps, who received it from Mr. ———, and he received it from Miss Grinikes, and concluded without attempting to prove what he had promised to do, at the precious lecture. Mr. Puttillow having been

referred to, in his lecture, took the privilege of replying, and in his remarks, referred to the letter of Seth Sprague, Esq., declining the appointment as one of the Vice Presidents of the Massachusetts

Abolition Society. Mr. Cummings said he would explain about the letter, as we were in an error respecting it. It was Seth Sprague, Jr., that was appointed, not his father. I was in Boston at the

time of the appointment, and meeting Seth Sprague, Esq., in the street, informed him that his son was appointed one of the Vice Presidents.' He then replied, 'it was through your influence.' The Secretary in directing the letter informing Mr. Sprague

any in enclosing the letter, mentioning said Sprague, Jr., of the appointment, inadvertently omitted to put on the junior, consequently Seth Sprague Esq., received the letter, knowing it was intended for his son, and immediately gave the public the letter

We, therefore, believing our aged friend and philanthropist incapable of such duplicity, felt it our duty to inquire of him respecting the matter.

Mr. Cumming has been industrious in disseminating his sectarian and political views on anti-slavery, through the whole length and breadth of Cape Cod. You will, no doubt, gratify many of your readers and oblige us by publishing this and the

**CHARLES H. FREEMAN,
THOMAS PUTTILLOW.**

A meeting of the Sandwich Anti-Slavery Society was held in the Town Hall, Wednesday evening, Feb. 25th—Thomas Puttillow, Chairman.

foregoing, in connexion with the Hon. Seth Sprague's letter, and approve of publishing them in the Barnstable Patriot, and request the editor of the Yarmouth Register to copy the same into his paper.

Hon. Seth Sprague's Letter.

DUXBURY, Feb. 11th, 1840.

Sir:—Your letter of the 3d was duly received, informing me of the movements of Hiram Cummings, in the County of Barnstable, and the use which he had made of my name. As to what he has said of

ne has made of my name. As to what he has said of me personally, it is of but little consequence, but when he undertakes to misrepresent and slander the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, every good man ought to expose his slanders, and counteract

the baneful influence which he is spreading. Your letter and print conveyed no new information to me; I have watched the movements of the agents of the new society from the beginning; they are hired

by the new society for the purpose of pulling down, and destroying, the old pioneer society of Massachusetts, and if they succeed in destroying that society and its principles, they destroy the whole anti-slavery enterprise.

The platform of the old society is broad enough for all to work upon; a narrower will not do. The Massachusetts Society was the first in the United States, and the principles of that society were en-

grafted into the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Its principles are those of equality, inviting all to join, knowing neither sect or party, but all to work together for the freedom of the

slave. This platform was too broad for the narrow sectarian views of Torrey, Wise, Cummings, and other kindred spirits, and they built a narrower one, excluding all the women, and allowing only one twenty-fifth of the men to act in the meetings of

what they call the Massachusetts Abolition Society. My soul abhors such narrow, contracted principles. I glory in standing on the old broad platform of equal rights. As to what Mr. Cum-

mings says about the woman being appointed on a committee, and the letter directed to me, I do not charge him with any intentional misrepresentations, but he ought to be more careful that he tells nothing but the truth. Mr. G.

ing but the truth. Mr. Cummings was not at the meeting when the woman he speaks of was appointed on a committee; he was then several hundred miles off. In his statement of that transaction he is very incorrect owing no doubt to his ignorance

of the subject. I wish that time and paper would allow me to state all that was transacted at that meeting, but it will not. It was at that meeting that the first ridiculous farce took place, by an at-

tempt to exclud women from taking a part in the great moral reform of the abolition of slavery. At the opening of the meeting, there was a motion made, I think by Mr. St. Clair, now an agent of the

new society.—That all persons believing it to be a sin to hold our fellow men in slavery, and who are in favor of immediate abolition, be requested to enroll their names as members of the Convention, and take part in its deliberations' The motion was

adopted unanimously without any objection, and all the abolition women enrolled their names. Soon after that, there was a request made that each member of the Convention pay one dollar to defray the

expenses of the Convention, and the women very generally paid their dollar. After that, there was an attempt made to expel the women from the Convention, but to the honor of the Convention be it said, that the men refused to do so: and here I think

So much for the woman question. A few words

on the letter which Mr. Cummings so much misrepresents, and I have done with these small matters, and will endeavor that the remainder of my letter shall be on more important subjects. On the

day when the new society chose its officers, I was informed by two gentlemen that I was chosen one of its Vice Presidents. As that notice was unofficial, I did not feel myself bound to take any notice of it, but after I arrived at home I received a letter

from the Secretary, informing me that I was chosen by the society one of its Vice Presidents, and requesting me to consent that my name might be published with the address, which was then preparing

for the press, and in the letter the principles of the

100

old positively be a new American... J. G. Whittier, and T. D. ... SPECTATOR. ... BERATOR ... STON: ... DATE, MARCH 12, 1840.

after ten years' experience--during which brief... the Advocate of Freedom. The language of... the Managers is not specially applied to the calling of... the Convention, but to the whole scheme for a new... political organization.

National Anti-Slavery Convention. If ever the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts... A. S. Society have evinced good sense, sound judgment... and a wise forecast, they have done so in making... their official Protest against the call for another... National Convention, as 'presumptuous, unauthorized, unnecessary, premature'--and in advising the abolitionists of the several States not to give it any countenance.

What is the professed end of the whigs? The... 'independent truth' of the Declaration of Independence... What the creed of the democrats? The... 'truth' they stand, then, in theory, upon the... anti-slavery platform--to wit, that 'all men are... created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator... with certain inalienable rights; that among these... are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' They... are divided upon questions of political economy--

How shall abolitionists vote? The editor of the Christian Witness, at Pittsburgh, Pa. propounds the following 'honest question': 'Will the editor of the Philanthropist, the Liberator, or the Charter Oak, tell us how voting abolitionists, at the next Presidential election, can exercise the elective franchise, honestly and efficiently, without a distinct and separate nomination of Electors, pledged to vote for no slaveholder or apologist for slavery? What shall they do? Vote for Harrison and Tyler?--for Van Buren and Johnson?--nominate separate candidates?--or abstain entirely from the exercise of the elective franchise?'

Beautiful Consistency. We have already stated, that, in the first number of the Abolitionist, it indignantly denied the charge that it was in favor of 'a distinct political party,' and added--'The Abolitionists, we trust, will erect no new standard of political action.' In the 31st number of the same paper, there is an address from the Norfolk County Abolition Society, in which is this passage: 'While we stand aloof from the organization of a political party, and the formation of a political party, we are not to be gained by calist in our ranks, nothing but the stern voice of duty to God and man can arouse the elector, or the public servant, to a proper regard to the claims of bleeding humanity.'

GOOD ADVICE. We take the liberty to publish the following letter, and commend it to the attention of our readers. Presto! change! What says the editor of the Abolitionist now? 'Between no-government and a human-rights [third political] party, we think we have demonstrated there is no middle ground, on more occasions than one.' So, then, not only does he coolly eat his own words, but with all possible effrontery insinuates that those who oppose such a political organization are no better, in fact, than anarchists!

Colored American. After a suspension of three months, the Colored American has started afresh, under the charge of our colored friend CHARLES B. RAY, its sole editor and proprietor. If, among the four hundred thousand free colored persons in the country,--to say nothing of the white population, from whom it ought to derive a strong support,--a living patronage for this paper cannot be obtained, it will be greatly to their reproach. In their present condition, a special organ of their own, conducted by one of their own number, ought to be regarded by them as an object of great importance. True, it does not follow that, because the paper is called the 'Colored American,' and edited by a colored man, therefore the colored population are under obligations to support it; for if it be, in itself, a faithful and useful journal, it cannot claim to be sustained on any other grounds. But we have confidence in the ability, perseverance and integrity of Mr. Ray, and doubt not that he will make the American an interesting sheet. If any persons, white or colored, in this city, desire to become subscribers to it, we will forward their names with great pleasure.

Gen. Harrison. The Abolitionist blows hot and cold with extraordinary facility. Because, at its annual meeting in January, the Mass. A. S. Society hailed the refusal of the Harrison Convention to nominate Henry Clay as the whig candidate for the Presidency, as virtually a concession to the growing spirit of liberty in our land, that paper basely insinuated that the Society is in favor of Harrison! In reply, we showed that the Abolitionist itself had previously said--'We are disposed to regard the late defeat of Clay as a triumph of anti-slavery truth.' What is its rejoinder? Why, it concedes that the Society 'had good cause to rejoice at the defeat of Henry Clay'--but wishes to know 'why it did not pass another resolution, at least warning abolitionists that it would be unsafe for Harrison, without evidence to contradict that which proves him an enemy to our cause?' Answer--not because the Society was disposed 'to favor Harrison,' or was ignorant of his pro-slavery acts, as the Abolitionist must have known when it made its slanderous imputation; but because, in the overwhelming pressure of business, and simply and solely on that account, no such resolution was prepared or thought of. The members of the Society are not the men to bestow their suffrages upon any pro-slavery candidate, or to need a special resolution to direct them how or for whom to vote. No resolution was passed at the meeting against Martin Van Buren; ergo, the Society has at length concluded to support his nomination!

But a word in relation to the treatment which Gen. Harrison has received at the hands of the Abolitionist, Emancipator, &c. Has it been such as accords with anti-slavery usage and policy? No. Hitherto, the pledge has been, not only that, as abolitionists, we will not vote for any man who is hostile to our enterprise, but that we will first interrogate every candidate for any legislative, gubernatorial or presidential station, in regard to his views of slavery, emancipation, &c. &c. before we condemn him. We have been disposed to allow space for repentance. Can we now do any thing less, as fair-minded and reasonable men? Though Edward Everett formerly took sides against us, yet, when interrogated, last year, in the usual manner, he answered our inquiries in the affirmative. We shall not stop to examine or question the purity of his motives: we only say that he has publicly endorsed the soundness of the doctrine of immediate emancipation, and officially marched from a pro-slavery position on to the anti-slavery platform. Is an occurrence of this kind nothing? Is it not an interesting sign of the times? Gen. Harrison has been nominated as a candidate for a high official station. In the course of his congressional career, it is certain that he uniformly sustained the slaveholding interest; and that, in 1835, he declared that 'the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional,' &c. Other black marks are recorded against him; but, we believe, he has said and done nothing against anti-slavery or its advocates, publicly, since 1835. That year was the nub-crisis of our cause. George Thompson was at that time in the country, and the whole land was seized with a phrenzy and murderous spirit. Witness the mobs in Boston and Utica. It is no marvel that, at such a period, Gen. Harrison (then a candidate for the presidency) should have denounced the anti-slavery movements. It was fashionable for every body to do so, from 'gentlemen of property and standing,' down to drunken and lawless disturbers of the peace. Doubtless, Gen. Harrison would not use the same language now, as he did in 1835; but we do not believe he is ready to retract his steps, and avow himself in favor of immediate emancipation. We say, this is our belief--but we may be mistaken, in common with many others. It is possible, but not probable, that he has become convinced of the injustice of his former course. What, then, do justice and long-suffering require of us? Why, obviously, that we should interrogate him, and give him a chance to retrieve his character in the eyes of the friends of freedom, before we pronounce his case hopeless. If we mistake not, Gerrit Smith and William Jay were appointed a committee, at the annual meeting of the Parent Society last year, to address letters of inquiry to the presidential candidates on this subject. Whether we are right or not, in this conjecture, we trust that Gen. Harrison will be drawn out; so that the whole country may know what are his present views and feelings respecting one of the noblest enterprises of the age.

THE LI

THE LI

LI

LI

LI

... was this a be
rule